DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 720	24	HE 002 504
AUTHOR	Kazanoff, Theodore	
TITLE	Feasibility Study on Combining a Community Theatre with a College Drama Department.	
INSTITUTION	Carnegie Inst. of Tech., Pittsburgh, Pa.	
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.	
BUREAU NO	BR-5-8264	
PUB DATE	31 Dec 65	
NOTE	50p.	
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29	
DESCRIPTORS	*Coordination; *Departments; *Drama; Dramatics; *Feasibility Studies; Higher Education; School Community Relationship; *Theaters	
IDENTIFIERS	*Pittsburgh Playhouse	

ABSTRACT

This is the report of a feasibility study on the subject of a formal association between the Drama Department of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh and the Pittsburgh Playhouse. Chapter I, the Introduction, states and defines the problem and presents the objectives and procedures of the study. Chapter II deals with questions of identity of the two organizations in terms of disputed motives, need for change, relation of the Playhouse Board, Club, and School, to aspects of association, and community theatre versus professional theatre. Chapter III examines the experiences with professional theatres of other institutions of higher education in Cleveland, Los Angeles, Seattle, Minneapolis, and Palo Alto. Chapter IV considers the roadblocks, of identity and motive, location and nature of new facilities, relations between training and performing, the Playhouse School, the local actor, and the organization of professional theatre. Chapter V presents the conclusions and examines the advantages to the association; possible changes as a result of association; community effects, organization and location of new theatre plants, effects on training; and the organization of professional theatre. Recommendations conclude the report. A report summary is attached. (AF)

ED054720

BR-5-8264
HE

FEASIBILITY STUDY ON COMBINING A COMMUNITY THEATRE WITH A COLLEGE DRAMA DEPARTMENT

Cooperative Research Project No. S-418

HE 002 504

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FEASIBILITY STUDY ON COMBINING A COMMUNITY THEATRE WITH A COLLEGE DRAMA DEPARTMENT

Cooperative Research Project No. S-418

Theodore Kazanoff

Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

31 December, 1965

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
Statement of problem, objectives, and procedure; definition of problem.

II. QUESTIONS OF IDENTITY 7
Disputed motives; need for change; relation of The Playhouse Board, Club and School to aspects of association; community theatre vs. professional theatre.

III. PRECEDENTS ELSEWHERE 14
Cleveland, Los Angeles, Seattle, Minneapolis, Palo Alto.

IV. ROADBLOCKS 21
Identity and motive; location and nature of new facilities; relations between training and performing; The Playhouse School; the local actor; organization of professional theatre.

V. CONCLUSIONS 28
Advantages to association; possible changes as a result of association; community effects; organization and location of new theatre plants; effects on training; organization of professional theatre.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS 37

VII. APPENDIX . . . . . (i)
Names of people interviewed.

I. Introduction

For many years the Department of Drama at Carnegie Institute of Technology (hereafter called CIT) has maintained an informal relationship with the local semi-professional theatre organization known as The Pittsburgh Playhouse (hereafter called The Playhouse). In these years a limited number of student actors from the department were cast in plays produced at The Playhouse and at times arrangements were made for a graduate student director to direct his thesis production at The Playhouse. This production was offered to the public by The Playhouse in its Theatre Upstairs, a small studio-type theatre. Members of the department's faculty frequently directed or acted in plays at The Playhouse, and, over the years, The Playhouse was the largest single employer of the department's graduates.

The Pittsburgh Playhouse has three theatres in one building, is operated by a trained, professional staff of 140 individuals, produces a full season of plays (with emphasis, in the past, on currect Broadway successes, particularly comedies and musicals), and provides a club and restaurant for its 7500 annual subscribers. The Playhouse also operates a part-time and non-degree school for children, young adults, and adults.

Over the last 10 years the annual average attendance at the plays produced by The Playhouse has been 115,000; additionally, the children's theater has attracted 35,000 annually over the same period.

In recent years The Playhouse has cast a greater proportion of its plays from the extensive pool of community actors in Pitts-

burgh. This has been particularly successful in its growing program of children's plays. For adult plays, however, the recent rapid increases in costs of production have meant that fewer and fewer professional actors could be used and at times the quality of performance has not been as good as the reputation of The Playhouse deserves. In the main, community support and response to The Playhouse program has been active and favorable.

In April 1965 the Department of Drama and The Pittsburgh Playhouse joined in forming the Playhouse/Carnegie Tech Company. The purpose of this Company was to develop a program of theater in Pittsburgh by means of professional production of a season of plays, in repertory, at The Playhouse and to pursue an educational program of advanced training in theatre arts for the theatre artists involved in the Company. The following results were hoped for from this program:

1. to create for young and aspiring theatre artists of more than average promise an educational program in an atmosphere of quality production so that their professional maturation would contribute to the excellence of theatre for many years into the future.

2. to elevate the professional theater to a level that would serve as a source of satisfaction and stimulation to Pittsburgh and that would stamp this community as one with a strong concern for the cultural growth of the performing arts in the United States.

The Department of Drama was especially enthusiastic about this project because it provided a means of directly affecting the development of professional theater; it served to give the department a way of partially satisfying its responsibility to the community; and it opens up wide possibilities for enhancing its educational program at many levels.

The Playhouse/Carnegie Tech Company engaged the services of Mr. William Ball and his producing and training organization known as The American Conservatory Theatre Foundation (ACT). This group produced a season of twelve plays in repertory composed of classical and contemporary dramas at The Playhouse, beginning 15 July 1965 and ending 6 December 1965. At the same time, Mr. Ball engaged his company in a training program on an advanced level. Many students of the Department of Drama and The Playhouse were given fellowships to work and perform with ACT. In the fall, members of ACT lectured and provided special courses for students in the Department of Drama at Carnegie Tech. The entire project was made possible by individual contributions, box office, grants from local foundations, and a grant from The Rockefeller Foundation.

The creation of the Playhouse/Carnegie Tech Company stimulated interest in finding ways of bringing the activities and program of the Department of Drama into a closer, more formal and fully integrated association with The Playhouse. In the initial conversations between the administrations of the two institutions, it was apparent that there were many areas for possible cooperation; some overlap of services that would have to be reconciled; certain programs that might be pursued independently; and that the opportunity existed to develop a high artistic level of theatrical production along with an educational program in drama at the pre-college, college, and adult levels that would be unique. Bringing together the community theater and the department of drama in a new university-based dramatic arts center would make it possible to share facilities in the educational program and in production areas and would also make it possible to share personnel.

Such a jointure suggested a very complicated administrative problem; the respective educational, artistic, and financial responsibilities of each organization had to be clearly defined and the actual means and timetable for the integration of activities had to be investigated and formulated. A study committee composed of administrative officers of The Pittsburgh Playhouse and Carnegie Institute of Technology discussed these problems. Finally, the committee felt the need of an objective point of view and of an investigation in depth of all the possibilities and problems pertaining to this project. It has been estimated that building a new dramatic arts center for the combined activities of the two organizations will cost between six and eight million dollars. With a project of this size and scope it is imperative that some estimate be made of community and foundation support that can be anticipated. An impartial investigator was needed to answer such questions.

This paper constitutes the report of the investigator hired by CIT to conduct a feasibility study on the subject of a formal association between the Department of Drama and The Playhouse.

The objectives of this study as outlined by the head of the CIT Department of Drama in writing are as follows: "to determine, by means of a feasibility study, the following:

a. the extent to which the activities and program of the Department of Drama, CIT, can be combined with those of The Pittsburgh Playhouse.

b. the areas of overlap, independent activity, and mutual responsibility in such a jointure.

c. the problem areas where further study or discussion is necessary.

d. the extent of community and national support for such a jointure.

e. the full range of possibilities created by this combination in the areas of education and producing theatre.

f. the precedents established in programs developed in other parts of the country.

g. the means and time-table by which such an integration of activities can be accomplished."

The investigator devoted two months considering these points, interviewing people and writing this report. The major portion of time was spent in a series of interviews* and consultations with:

a. current members of the CIT Department of Drama

b. selected members of the CIT administrative staff

c. selected members of The Playhouse Board

d. selected members of The Playhouse staff

e. several members of the Pittsburgh community, including local Foundation authorities, although there has been no attempt at a comprehensive sample of community opinion

f. heads of professional theatre and university drama departments in Cleveland, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, Seattle, Minneapolis, and Ann Arbor.

In all, fifty-six (56) persons were interviewed, the great majority from groups a, b, c, and d. The opinions of the interviewees were put into written reports and are in the hands of the head of the Department of Drama. The investigator's report which follows is based on a study of the interviews and represents his summation and evaluation of the issues raised in the interviews. The latter part of the report contains recommendations regarding the nature of the proposed association.

The coming of a professional** theatre company to Pittsburgh performing in a repertory of significant modern and classical plays

* Appendix I contains the list of names of all those interviewed.
** In this report, professional refers to those who earn their living in the theatre; avocational and local refer to those who are not dependent on the theatre for a livelihood.

has generated an enthusiasm and excitement for theatre which has not been felt for many years. This was the unanimous opinion of those interviewed in Pittsburgh. This excitement was expressed in different ways: the importance of professional production to the emerging cultural image of the city, the raising of standards of theatre in play choice and performance, the significant changes in the quality of entertainment from emphasis on the light and trivial to plays of intellectual and aesthetic stature, a recognition of the advantages and need for advanced training of professional theatre artists, and the possibilities by joining two major local theatre forces, CIT and The Playhouse, to continue professional theatre. It is the last element which is the primary concern of this report.

Although majority opinion from CIT, The Playhouse, and the community would seem to favor some form of closer association, there are many problems to be solved before any such formal cooperation can take place. These problems fall in the areas of objectives, motives and identity of both parties; the relation of Playhouse Club, Restaurant and School to any new entity; the location, size and nature of any new facilities which may be built as a result of jointure; the administration of this new enterprise, the relationship of a new organizational structure to any professional company that might perform in Pittsburgh; and the organization and policy of the professional company itself. The main body of the report tries to summarize the opinions which have been expressed on these subjects and to give some picture of the ways other university and community and/or professional theatres have answered these problems.

II. QUESTIONS OF IDENTITY

Any formal association between two parties requires a clear definition of identity on the part of both. There is a question on the part of the CIT Drama faculty as to what now are the objectives of The Playhouse and what is its status financially and organizationally. The desire to know what it is they are dealing with reveals itself in many ways which indicate a state of confusion regarding the motives of both parties. Why, for instance, has the question of association become paramount now? There was little in the past relationship of CIT Drama and The Playhouse to suppose that such a move was under way. Although The Playhouse and the Department of Drama had an informal policy of student exchange so that actors and directors from CIT Drama were "let out" for involvement in The Playhouse productions and one member of The Playhouse taught a regular course at CIT, the policies of both institutions were sufficiently different in play choice, relationship to audience, and standards of production to question now the real reasons for closer association. Even the new departure of The Playhouse and CIT in jointly sponsoring the advent of The American Conservatory Theatre (hereafter called ACT), a professional producing and training organization occupying the premises of The Playhouse plant, instead of diminishing the areas of confusion, only makes more apparent the need for answers to the questions of objectives, policies, and motives in a future alliance.

The situation is complicated by the continuing presence of the organizational arms of The Playhouse, such as the Board of

Directors, the Club and Restaurant, and the School. There is question as to the role of the Board of Directors in the decisions of The Playhouse to bring ACT to Pittsburgh, the extent of its commitment to professional theatre as represented by ACT, and as a corollary of this, the extent of its commitment to the idea of community theatre, or production based upon the paid and unpaid services of local avocational actors, in the future plans of The Playhouse. One of the members of the Board stated clearly that The Playhouse purpose from the beginning was the establishment of professional theatre in Pittsburgh and that only the pressure of financial circumstance caused the compromise of this intent. The time has come for The Playhouse to return to its original purpose now that the idea of repertory or, better, the professional decentralization of theatre has become a more or less accepted condition for survival and improvement of the theatre in this country, along with a concern for the cultural status of the performing arts, and the availability of Foundation money to support experiments in the development of professional theatre.

Another Playhouse Board member stressed the need for The Playhouse to develop a product worthy of sale in the community. The decision to bring ACT to Pittsburgh was the first step in shaping a saleable product for a city whose changing nature makes an alive, exciting professional theatre an important selling point to doctors, scientists and skilled professionals of all kinds whose services are needed in research, industry and civic life and who demand from the city in return a cultural environment of the highest quality. If Pittsburgh is to grow in civic,

industrial and scientific leadership, the artistic and intellectual life of the city is going to have to grow correspondingly. Pittsburgh is no longer a mill-town, but the cultural lag is showing.

The question is still valid, then, to what extent does this kind of thinking represent the opinion of the majority of The Playhouse Board?

According to a significant number of CIT Drama faculty, the Club and Restaurant, as continuing aspects of the 'old' Playhouse, must be considered in the question of closer association. How much do these concerns of The Playhouse constitute the prevailing interest of present Board members and of what significance are they in an accurate picture of the current Playhouse financial condition? Representatives of The Playhouse and community consider the retaining of the Club necessary to a complete theatre event and, therefore, would not like to see it disappear if The Playhouse moves in the direction of closer cooperation with CIT. It also provides substantial income to The Playhouse in the form of a hidden subsidy.

It is significant that many members of the Board are not now emotionally or ideologically committed to the concept or the image of The Playhouse as theatre. Those who wholeheartedly approve of the role The Playhouse has played in bringing ACT to Pittsburgh are far more concerned with the machinery necessary to keep professional theatre performing in Pittsburgh than with the question of what will happen to The Playhouse as image or organization in an association with CIT. To these people the possibilities of improving the level of play production in Pittsburgh in choice of play, in standards of theatrical production, and in level of

artistry in acting, are the principal areas of interest, and they would devote all energy to achieving these goals.

There is even wider agreement among Board members, although by no means unanimous, that the identity of The Playhouse as a community theatre, that is, as a platform for local players playing popular theatre for a mass audience at a popular price, is a thing of the past, and that all energies in the future should be devoted to making professional theatre, of the kind represented by ACT, continuing and stable.

And yet the fear of loss of identity of The Playhouse in the face of these opinions, remains a serious and constant threat. The threat is most apparent when the question arises as to what will happen to The Playhouse School in a future alignment. If the former Playhouse image as a producing theatre has little to recommend it to many people, artistically or financially, the image of The Playhouse School gains support from some of these same people for reasons which may have little to do with the quality of its product. Once again we are faced with the gap which exists between idea and practice. Members of The Playhouse staff recognize that the School is not now fulfilling its original intent, which was to create a full-time program culminating in a two-year certificate award. The bulk of the teaching at the School is part-time on the pre-adult level, while the full-time students constitute but a small fraction of the total enrollment.

Of some 1,700 students, only 50 are full-time, and their age range is between 18 and 25. This age spread is the same as that for CIT full-time drama students. There are many who believe there is an overlap here, even if the Playhouse School gives training to

those who cannot afford to go to CIT and to those who may not meet the educational requirements for entrance to CIT. Solutions which have been offered stress the need for CIT to weigh talent, ability and dedication over academic requirements and to offer scholarships to those whose talents warrant them and whose financial need requires them.

As for the course content and program of the School, there is strong criticism from CIT Drama faculty of the practically non-existent extrance requirements, the lack of standards within the classroom, and the attitude of the School staff which makes pleasing the parents in an end-of-term showcase more important than releasing the imagination and creativity of the youngster. The full-time program has come in for criticism because of lack of sufficient number of class hours for instruction and the over-extension of School activities in order to keep the School self-supporting, which has resulted in the lowering of standards.

The attitude of some of The Playhouse staff toward the School is one which looks toward the future while recognizing certain inadequacies in the past, mainly as a result of financial pressures to keep the School afloat. It is the sincere desire of the Director of the School to recruit a better type of student who could benefit from the more free-wheeling environment which the School provides. In this regard, he feels the School's central advantage over CIT Drama is its greater freedom from the pressures of university degree requirements in the training of highly individual talents (although the present policy of the School seems to regard the supplying of actors for Playhouse production

and the building of a more appreciative theatre audience of the future as primary goals). The presence of ACT, according to the School director, will radically alter the nature of the School's program and identity in the future.

Playhouse Board members vary in opinion about the School as a training institution. For some the elocutionary emphasis on speech and body training as aspects of the building of poise and personal confidence constitute the strongest arguments in favor of retaining the identity of the School in a future association of The Playhouse and CIT. Others who see the School as a training ground for performance in the crafts and arts of the theatre are far from happy with its results to date.

But there is a strong emotional tie to the School as perhaps the only remaining core of identity left to The Playhouse and, therefore, a reluctance to see it disappear in the changes that will take place when the new face of theatre in Pittsburgh emerges.

In many ways, the problem of The Playhouse School of the Theatre is unique to this area. Only one city of all those visited has a functioning school as an adjunct of the professional production program. But The Cleveland Playhouse director considers the School there as essentially a production outlet for pre-adults. There is little formal instruction on the classroom level since the belief in Cleveland is that learning about and for theatre is only valid as part of the specific problem of putting on a play. Theoretical aspects of training belong to the university, and practical training belongs to the practicing professional theatre. The identity of The Cleveland Playhouse School is in the productions of the Children's Theatre, which is considered more a production

outlet than a school offering training in the principles and techniques of acting or stage management. In this regard, it would be interesting to discover whether The Pittsburgh Playhouse School has a greater interest in the productions of its Children's Theatre and their actors and technicians or in the part-time classes which it offers to these same actors and technicians.

One wonders at this point whether the question of identity is not crucial to any discussion of integration - psychologically, organizationally, educationally and artistically - not merely as regards the present structures of each of the parties, but in any future relationship, when a new entity may be created which may modify the existing structures. The possible loss of educational standards and control over educational policy worries most of the CIT Drama faculty in any consideration of CIT and The Playhouse drawing together.

There are those at The Playhouse who fear the loss of structure and even name, if any association takes on the form of amalgamation with the location of the professional theatre on campus. If the university dominates the relationship, they feel it will tend to emphasize the educational nature of the theatre and reduce its value as entertainment for the community.

CIT Drama has a recognized reputation as a training school for professional theatre; The Playhouse is in the process of going through a change of life. It is conceivable that the stability of the one will be affected by the insecurities of the other.

III. PRECEDENTS ELSEWHERE

The experiences of other institutions of higher education with professional theatres in their same geographical area would be relevant at this point to gain some perspective on the kinds of associations they have formed and the scope of any future plans for association.

One has to admit at the outset that at two of the five areas visited, the situation is fraught with distrust, jealousy, and even hostility. In Los Angeles and Seattle, the arrangement is either non-existent or minimal to the extent of making agreements on paper inoperative in practice. Although Theatre Group uses the facilities of the UCLA campus, such as campus halls for performing, Central Staging for construction of sets and use of lighting equipment, and the various UCLA agencies for program, public relations, and publicity, the relationship with the Theatre Arts Division of UCLA is at the moment stalemated. The chairman of the Theatre Arts Division expressed the condition as "never the twain shall meet" until Theatre Group becomes a truly professional theatre with a home of its own and a company of its own (Theatre Group now jobs in actors for each production) guaranteeing continuity and stability. Another member of the Theatre Arts Division, although admitting that cooperation has existed in the past through graduate students on the Master of Fine Arts program, expressed the current relationship as a very complicated one in which the fear of domination by the professional company and the consequent deterioration of the student training program was ever present. The executive coordinator of Theatre

Group felt cooperation at the present time seemed impossible because of the prevailing isolation of the university theatre, the jealousies arising out of status and position, the differences in outlook between the two, and the poor training of university theatre people for work in professional theatre. Ant yet, despite the difficulties in practice, the hope of all parties was for some affiliation, particularly on the graduate level, to foster the development of ensemble theatre, where the university provides a pool of talent for the professional theatre and the professional theatre accepts graduate students as "interns" in a continuing program of training.

If the Los Angeles situation was stalemated, the condition in Seattle was one of cold war. The forces of obstruction and hostility, under control in Los Angeles, had erupted in force in Seattle. But of significance here were certain remarks made by the heads of the Repertory Theatre and the University Theatre Department affecting the general philosophy behind cooperation. The Repertory Theatre head expressed the view that further cooperative gestures would be made only when the University Theatre recognized the seniority of the professional theatre in any partnership. The University Theatre head expressed a disenchantment with repertory and ensemble theatre for the following reasons: (1) the process of "natural selection" often works in reverse in repertory, weeding out more talented members, (2) repertory produces fatig e among the actors, and (3) the forced close association of company personnel often saps the creativity of new ideas. And yet the hope persists that given the proper set of circumstances, including compatible personalities,

cooperation would have real benefit for both parties. This hope seems more realistic with the recent appointment of a new artistic director for the Repertory Theatre.

As in Los Angeles and Seattle, the continuing performances of professional production at the University of Michigan have revitalized theatre in the whole community. Audience attendance has increased not only for the professional theatre, but also for local theatre groups presenting serious plays, and the quality of professional production has served as a yardstick to measure standards for first-rate theatre.

At Michigan, the University engages an already existing company, APA, to present a series of plays on campus and to tour the state for two weeks after the regular season. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the relationship is the fact that the University pays all the bills, including salaries and costs of production, and expects to operate at a deficit. It is in fact subsidizing the productions of APA during its season there to the extent of $40,000 to $50,000 each year, and this even when APA plays to 90% capacity. According to the executive director of the professional theatre program, it is likely that APA will continue as a deficit operation even after a new theatre is built on campus with a larger seating capacity than the hall now used for professional repertory production.

In addition, APA has been subsidized in the arrangements concluded with the Phoenix Theatre in New York whereby APA presented on the Phoenix stage several of its Michigan productions without charge from the University for the use of production elements.

If professional theatre has enriched the community, it has had little effect on the program of the Drama Department. There has been little contact between faculty and professional and not enough educational interchange. Graduate fellows study at the University and do practical work for degree credit under assignment from members of the professional company. There has been little coordination of policy and objectives, and little or no discussion of the problems of training for professional theatre.

The future of the professional company is uncertain. APA has been refused a Ford Foundation grant for performance on Broadway, but its return to the University of Michigan campus for a fifth season is very likely.

Stanford provides a perspective from another angle. In the fall of 1965, the University brought a group of professional actors to campus to form a resident performing company. Some of these actors teach courses offered by the Drama Department to drama majors. The program was made possible by a grant from The Rockefeller Foundation, but the University has recognized its position as patron and is willing to subsidize the professional program once foundation money runs out. Another important aspect of this arrangement is the administrative control which the Drama Department has over the professional company. Although no artistic director has been appointed yet, the belief being that the role and function of such a person in relation to the Drama Department and the University is yet to be determined, the experiment gives priority to the existing University Drama structure in production and policy.

Cleveland also represents a new departure. A deteriorating

relationship between the Cleveland Playhouse and Western Reserve University has forced a new alliance between the Playhouse and the new Cleveland State University (hereafter called CSU), a branch of Ohio State University. In the past, the Cleveland Playhouse offered two courses for credit to graduate students from Western Reserve. At present, the head of the University Drama Department has misgivings about the educational validity of these courses, and the director of the Playhouse feels the weight of University academic degree requirements. It is interesting to note that a major attempt to establish closer connections between Western Reserve and the Cleveland Playhouse ended in failure. The Playhouse Board of Directors turned down a plan for three new theatres on University Circle land, because of disagreement as to location of the new complex of buildings and the possible loss of club and restaurant privileges through a University ruling establishing one central club for all University personnel. Still, the hope persists that some alliance can be made, as witness the as yet untried plans for cooperation between the Playhouse and CSU. To the head of the Playhouse the advantages of financial security in the form of tax money for a new Playhouse plant on land adjacent to CSU, the educational environment which can enhance the cultural life of professional actors and designers, and the chance to wed the theoretical training offered by the University which has an emphasis on experimentation and new ideas with the practical experience offered by the professional theatre, makes the struggle worth the effort.

But one must travel the road to Minneapolis to look at the "model" before giving up the ghost that such a jointure of

educational and professional is feasible. There were hints here and there that many of the answers to the complex questions of professional and educational policy, administrative control, and location of plant were to be found in the relationship of almost three years' duration between the University of Minnesota (hereafter called U. of M.) and the Guthrie Theatre. It would be hard to describe the existing concord between them as ideal, but the seeds of future growth and development are present. Attitudes and personal compatibility are as much a part of the total picture as any means or structure created for mutual exchange.

Tyrone Guthrie laid down the premise of cooperation when he said this arrangement was not a marriage, but an affair. (One is plagued by the thought that affairs are often short-lived.) His choice of Minneapolis as his home for a professional theatre seems to have been governed more by a liking for U. of M. people as well as the city than for any substantial economic advantage. Originally, the plan was to locate the new professional theatre building on campus, but slow-moving University machinery made the choice of a site off-campus more desirable. In this regard, it is interesting to note that all University people interviewed are happy in retrospect for the separation, feeling that conflicts would be magnified if the professional theatre were physically and organizationally close to the University Drama facilities. The manager of the Guthrie Theatre, while not dissatisfied with the location of the theatre, had no objections to locating a professional theatre on campus so long as there were "walls" around it.

Walls are means of separation, and some form of separation seems to be the means by which cooperation can begin to take place.

Outside of Stanford, the prevailing opinion is that strict autonomy for both training school and professional company is necessary if both are to maintain identity. The U. of M. Theatre Arts Department and the Guthrie Theatre are entirely separate organizations that have bridged the physical and organizational distance through the McKnight Fellowship program. Students under this program are chosen for scholarship and artistic abilities. They spend under the present fellowship arrangements one year at the University and a second year at the Theatre. While at the Theatre, they are to all intents and purposes under the jurisdiction of the Theatre. The program has been most successful, perhaps, in stimulating discussion about the training of the actor and making the University take a long look at its role as a training school for professional theatre. The evaluation of the McKnight program by both sides has produced significant changes in the thinking of University people, and plans are being made to conduct far-reaching experiments in the training of the actor for repertory theatre. One of the premises of the existing association is the division of labor - the professional theatre producing theatre, the University training for theatre - with the door left open for the exchange of ideas and faculty. According to the manager of the Guthrie Theatre, it is unlikely that the Theatre will conduct a school of its own for economic reasons, but also because many professionals have no desire to teach or study on any formal level. The active principle remains each party doing what it can do best in the best possible way. Walls separate, but when a gateway is opened, the flow to and from reduces isolation and maximizes flexibility.

One might wish for even more areas of cooperation between

the Guthrie Theatre and the U. of M. Theatre Department, but the road is a thorny one beset with obstacles that are a part of the long history of the separation of "educational" and "professional-commercial" theatre. Only constant communication between those who are dedicated to theatre as art, audience and education can make those obstacles surmountable. In the words of the Guthrie Theatre manager, "An association between the university and the professional theatre is most desirable, if not imperative," but we're dealing with two different worlds, and there are roadblocks to interchange.

On the basis of a month's short experience investigating these different worlds, the roadblocks may look more like high tension barricades, but the hope persists that ways can be found so that good fences may truly make good neighbors if the barriers are without and not within.

IV. ROADBLOCKS

What are the roadblocks in the quest for closer ties between CIT Drama and The Playhouse? The listing below is presented as an objective appraisal and with due apologies for any presumptions it may contain and for necessary or unnecessary repetitions.

1) There is the ambiguous nature of The Playhouse at present. Its identity seems to be more in the nature of an entrepreneur 'letting out' its plant to a professional company for a period of time. Will it become a producing agent for a professional company in the future? What happens when ACT leaves in terms of its obligation to continue producing? What is the conclusive opinion of its Board of Directors regarding its commitment to professional theatre? What is its financial situation, to answer the suspicions of those on the CIT Drama faculty that any association is to help bail out

The Playhouse? Is The Playhouse committed to retaining the Club and Restaurant?

2) Does CIT see the closer affiliation as a means of getting its own long-sought-after theatre? If so, there are many on its Drama faculty who feel stronger reasons must be found. There is strong suspicion that any Playhouse association which gives priority to a professional company will compromise CIT Drama standards of training unless CIT retains the controlling hand in the appointment of the artistic director and in the means set up for his review. Most of the Drama faculty consider an association with a professional company in terms of training from "birth to grave" advantageous to CIT but wonder if The Playhouse will contribute anything more to such an association than its name.

A repertory theatre which has training connections with the CIT Drama School allows the student, who has completed his basic training in theatre, to use and perfect this training under the conditions and discipline of professional production. Students who graduated from CIT Drama in the past were forced to gain professional production experience in the hectic and chaotic conditions of New York. If a professional theatre were present in Pittsburgh, a more meaningful and controlled experience could be achieved. The presence of a quality professional company also conditions the attitudes of students regarding the place of the actor, designer and manager in repertory and in the community.

3) There is opinion from all ranks which favors the location of a professional company on campus to facilitate and enliven educational exchange and communication between student, faculty and professional, to provide a single university administrative control which can

thereby reduce administrative costs, and to permit the sharing of facilities, in the area of scenery, lighting and costume shops and storage. Opinion which favors an off-campus location sees the university becoming commercially oriented, involving itself in the inevitable competition for funds from its training and producing branches, contending with business procedures of professional theatre which require quick, day-to-day decisions, and contributing to dangerous insecurities on the part of its theatre personnel. Many professional theatre people chafe under academic protocol and what they call university red-tape. There is also a fear that too close a marriage physically can cause a dangerous dependence one on the other to the extent of making the failures of one the responsibilities of the other. Opinions of professionals show concern for the location of the professional company on campus because of the possible confusion in the public's mind between their productions and those of the university. But there is also a feeling that good public relations can eliminate any stigma which may be attached to the professional on campus.

Is CIT ready to assume the subsidization of a professional theatre if it is located on campus? To what extent can it take the place of the Foundation when Foundation support gives way?

4) The location, size and use of new plants for the educational theatre and the professional company presents many problems. Several Playhouse Board members feel a new plant for the professional company is necessary to improve the quality of production and the enjoyment of the audience. The Playhouse in the past tried to raise money for a new theatre, considering the sites of the present Howard Johnson Motor Lodge and the Edwards property around the Bureau of Mines Building as possible locations. The attempt then was not

successful, but the possibility now of continued professional theatre has reawakened interest and enthusiasm for new buildings. Much of the interest centers around a new home for CIT Drama as well as the professional company, seeing them as part of a package to improve the possibilities of training and production.

Others from CIT Drama question whether new theatres are the answer, suggesting that the problem of association is unnecessarily complicated by plant considerations. Nevertheless, majority opinion talks in terms of new buildings for both CIT and the professional company.

Many professionals and educators alike are wary of joint use of scene and costume workshops, if the professional theatre and educational theatre are close-by. They feel the differing needs of the student in the process of learning and the professional working to meet a deadline make the sharing of facilities extremely difficult. Even one large workshop to accommodate both, while certainly more feasible, would make for severe scheduling problems. On the other hand, they have no objections to joint use of storage areas.

The question of plant would seem to require further investigation by experts before decisions can be made.

5) Is CIT Drama prepared to accept the responsibilities of community theatre if The Playhouse School is changed? Majority opinion in Pittsburgh considers the School inadequate to the task of training students on a professional level. In the past, CIT Drama has turned down involvement in any pre-college or avocational actor training except as part of its summer school program. CIT faculty and staff is now divided as to how much it feels responsible for amateur theatre in Pittsburgh. Fairly unanimous opinion relegates

the adult avocational actor in performance to the little suburban theatre and the high school auditorium. Many would favor offering classes for the avocational actor if it did not mean compromising the college professional program. To what extent can The Playhouse School under any circumstances offer professional training? Private independent schools, academies or conservatories will be hard pressed in the future to find economic support for more than a piece-meal theatre program, according to a member of the University of Minnesota staff.

Shall CIT accept a role in community theatre training program through an extension division program separate from its current professional one? There are many who wonder whether CIT would want to take over the training of the avocational and pre-college actor. Very few feel any moral obligation on the part of CIT toward either amateur theatre or the specialized training of the non-professional and pre-college actor, yet there is a sentiment favoring classes for the high school student for the practical purpose of discovering unusual talent while it is still fresh. There is also some opinion favoring refresher courses for high school drama teachers to improve the level of instruction in the high school and to make the program at CIT more widely known.

While responsibility may be too strong a word, there would seem to be services which the university can offer in the way of classes and laboratories for youngster and adult to provide for amateur self-expression, to foster talent in the young, to improve standards of appreciation and critical evaluation on the part of the community, and to afford outlets for advanced CIT Drama directing and technical majors in the productions of area little theatres.

A study of children's and pre-college theatre, covering the ages from 6 to 17, seems to require an investigation of creative dramatics programs elsewhere, particularly at Northwestern University, before any real evaluation can be made.

6) What is the relation of ACT to the Carnegie Tech/Playhouse Company? Confusion exists in many minds as to what ACT is and what the Carnegie Tech/Playhouse Company is. There is also confusion about the future of ACT in Pittsburgh. Is ACT preparing itself for a New York debut? There is opinion which doubts any strong commitment of ACT to Pittsburgh and wishes to ensure the continuation of professional theatre in Pittsburgh if ACT moves elsewhere. Can the Carnegie Tech/Playhouse Company be legalized so that it can hire an artistic director and maintain some control over budget? Should the company appoint a coordinator as liason between the professional company and the Drama Department, assuming the separate organizations of both, and as consultant on ways and means of financing a company after Foundation money runs out?

7) Shall fellowships and apprenticeships be the training connections between the professional company and the Drama Department? Shall the professional company conduct its own classes for members of the company as well as fellows and apprentices? Many people in both branches of theatre feel that any association on the training level at the present time should involve only graduate students who are mature enough to make the necessary adjustments between training and performance. There is also some question about the connotation of apprentice for a Bachelor of Fine Arts graduate from CIT Drama when one would expect him to be given greater responsibility than the word implies if he is accepted into the company.

8) Shall the Drama faculty of CIT become involved in the activities of the professional company? Only in Cleveland and Stanford (and between ACT and CIT in Pittsburgh) is there an arrangement which permits the cross-over of teaching faculty into the areas of professional production. In Minneapolis (and Michigan) the traffic is one way from professional theatre to campus. Tyrone Guthrie has conducted workshops and directed plays on the University of Minnesota campus; Douglas Campbell, associate director of the Guthrie Theatre, will direct on campus in the fall. (Members of APA conduct seminars for the Drama Department at the University of Michigan.)

Whatever the arrangement, some form of exchange is accepted in principle, but the questions of quality, competence, and attitude, which have plagued cooperation in the past, remain as obstacles. Several CIT Drama faculty would like to participate in a professional program as teachers or theatre artists; some professionals, whether reluctantly or willingly, would accept a formalized teaching post.

The guiding principle remains the separation of powers, but in Pittsburgh the cooperation of a professional training staff with a professional producing company would seem to offer the possibility of enrichment to both.

continued on page 28.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The following thoughts and suggestions are an attempt to pull together into some coherency the welter of opinion and to answer some of the questions that have been raised.

The Playhouse in seeking closer ties with CIT is motivated by the desire to ensure the continued presence of high-quality professional production in Pittsburgh. It must do so as a business consideration since its past product has outgrown its usefulness and saleability; it must do so as a civic consideration since it is not alone a business but has become a necessity to the continued growth and prosperity of the city as a whole. CIT seeks closer ties with The Playhouse because its future as a training school for theatre is intimately related to the growth of professional theatre in Pittsburgh and in the nation. As a professional institution it must seek to expand the opportunities for its graduates to make a living in their chosen fields, and as a school it must provide an expanded educational environment to allow the talents of its students to grow and mature in an atmosphere of quality production.

Although the above arguments have been stated before, they bear continued repetition to keep the larger objectives continually before us. It is no doubt true that a way out financially is a part of the present Playhouse thinking and that the chance to pull out an architectural plum of a theatre is a part of CIT's thinking, but from this vantage point they are not primary reasons for any closer association. The Playhouse has substantial assets and one of the largest subscriptions of any theatre in the country.

That it is concerned with its economic future is only the better part of good business sense. CIT has an excellent theatre school, and that it is concerned about its present inadequate plant is also only the better part of good educational sense.

Hopefully, some form of cooperation will alleviate the pressures of making ends meet in the future and replacing obsolete facilities, but the first thought is the means by which these ends can be achieved. To both parties, the continued life of professional theatre is vital to each and to Pittsburgh. Neither, alone, can create the conditions by which professional theatre can prosper. It is fairly commonly accepted that, initially, high quality professional production will require some form of subsidy. There are many others who believe some form of subsidy will be required for a long time to come if the professional theatre is not to cut back on its choice of play, production standards, and quality of acting. Together, The Playhouse and CIT stand a much better chance of raising the money necessary to launch a professional company (as they have with ACT) and to keep it running. Major Foundations and local sources of money are more interested in the potential of the two major theatre powers joining forces for the improvement of theatre within the community than one alone dominating the scene.

That the establishment of a stable professional theatre in Pittsburgh is having a disturbing effect on the local, avocational actor is only stating a known fact. Both The Playhouse and CIT have agreed that the local actor in the future will have to make his accommodations with the professional company, if he passes its test. This is not to rule out participation by local actors in the company, only to state the priority of professionalism, i.e., the

the qualified actor making his living in the theatre, over avocationalism.

Both CIT and The Playhouse have committed themselves to the continued existence of professional theatre in Pittsburgh to serve as a model of excellence for student and playgoer alike, to enlarge the educational possibilities for training in theatre, and to provide the basis for a stimulating interchange of ideas between professional, faculty, student and audience. But, so far, neither has been asked to sacrifice anything to achieve that ideal.

Still, it would be unrealistic to assume that both parties can simply add an area of participation without affecting their basic attitudes and basic patterns of existence. Should CIT formalize an association with The Playhouse, it can no longer remain isolated within university walls. It becomes a professional training institution with a direct interest in and concern for the health and welfare of a certain kind of theatre within the community. This is all to the good so long as the extension and improvement of its own training program remains wholly within its own hands. One of the more bitter comments from professionals has been on the manner in which university drama has grown weak and complacent in the womb of security. That the charge is inapplicable to CIT Drama gives it all the more right and privilege to help give the producing theatre in this country artistic stature.

The change for The Playhouse is, perhaps, even more drastic. Should it formalize an association with CIT, the main core of its existence would become the implementation and perpetuation of quality professional theatre in Pittsburgh. This new look at this time will have a profound effect on the function and program of its own School. The objectives of the School on the full-time and

and adult part-time level as outlined by its director are to provide a pool of actors for Playhouse production and to train people in theatre. The first of these objectives becomes inoperative if The Playhouse changes its course, and the second to some extent competes with the CIT Drama program.

A possible solution to this problem is the creation of a new community theatre division separate from the present college program of CIT Drama and the professional company. The logical place for this division would be in the new facilities at CIT under the combined auspices of CIT and The Playhouse. (The question of children's theatre in school and production requires more comprehensive study than this report can give.) A community theatre division working through CIT and The Playhouse can evolve a program to take care of the avocational actor in laboratories and workshops on and off the campus and to ensure the placement of highly talented actors, designers or managers of college age or over who for one reason or another cannot attend CIT's Drama School.

This is not to suggest that the community theatre division would organize so-called little theatres. Outside of its major efforts of conducting classes and workshops, it can set up a service branch to advise and assist local amateur theatres and college theatres with speakers, technical aids, and directors (perhaps in association with the CIT director training program). It can also keep an active list of available local theatre personnel. An interesting and provocative project could be the organization of a summer theatre and a mobile theatre to present productions in the environs of Pittsburgh. The greater the amount and quality of amateur and college theatre in the Pittsburgh area, the

stronger the potential support and patronage for professional theatre.

The principle guiding the relationship between training and production is division of labor and powers. Separation seems essential to ensure the integrity of each. As the CIT administration invests authority in the head of its Drama Division, so any formalized association between CIT and The Playhouse should invest authority in an artistic director who would be responsible for the productions of the professional company in choice of play and selection of artistic personnel. The body representing the joint association of CIT and The Playhouse, such as a Board of Directors, would hire the artistic director and approve the annual budget of the professional company. The artistic director would be free to select his own company of actors, designers and technicians, but these people would be under contract to the parent body.

In order to ensure open communication between the training and producing agencies, the parent organization of CIT and The Playhouse should appoint an executive coordinator who could serve as liason between them and as head of the new community theatre division. One of the major responsibilities of this executive coordinator would be to keep the three areas of professional theatre, training school and community services informed about what is going on in each and to serve as a link with the larger community of Pittsburgh.

The question of new theatre plants, perhaps, needs more discussion from authorities in that field. There can be no question that CIT Drama needs a new plant, and there is reason to believe that a professional company does too, since the present

Playhouse plant, which consists of two theatres constructed along conventional, proscenium lines, is inadequate to the demands of repertory. There is little chance for experimenting with new audience-stage relationships, and the stages themselves make the quick changes of scenery difficult. There is also the very practical problem of parking. At present, parking facilities are totally inadequate at The Playhouse.

If it should be decided that new plants are necessary, one of the best ways to keep the separation of powers is to locate the new home of the professional company off-campus, perhaps adjacent to campus property, but with no direct tie to the CIT administration. The primary reasons would be the availability of local sources of money for a joint operation, the maintenance of equal authority between CIT and The Playhouse, and the emphasis upon the entertainment value as well as the educational value of the new theatre. It would also dispel the fears that the professional on campus would soon dominate any training program. With the theatre off-campus, the Club and Restaurant could be retained. Many of The Playhouse Board who were instrumental in securing the change in direction of Playhouse activities are in favor of the accessibility of restaurant and bar so that dinner, drinks and show can be part of a single evening in the theatre. The fact of Club membership, however, should not reduce the efforts of the theatre to extend its audiences and to educate the whole community to the enjoyment of quality theatre. It is perhaps true that in the beginning the audience for professional theatre will come from intellectual and elite ranks, but, as has been mentioned by several Board and community people, strong

efforts should be made to reach union, ethnic and youth groups as a matter of civic as well as business interest.

In terms of training, the heads of the Drama School and the professional company should be free to determine their own educational policy and choice of personnel. But every effort should be made to involve the regular CIT Drama faculty in any professional company program of instruction, as well as the professional staff in the regular Drama School classes, whenever schedules permit. This is not to suggest a compromise in training methods or standards, or the choice of professionals to teach who are not interested or capable, but rather that the potential for fruitful exchange exists if contact and discussion can be established initially between the artistic director and the Department head and a common philosophy regarding exchange agreed upon. The manner or structure for cross-over of faculty and professional staff seems less important than keeping the channels of communication open.

On the student level, it would seem best to keep the undergraduate away from participation in the professional company during the regular school year. In this regard, the professional company would not engage in training on any beginning or intermediate level. The area of exchange and common responsibility would be on the graduate level. Graduates with the full approval of the Drama School faculty would join a junior professional company under the jurisdiction of the artistic director after they had finished a core of training under the jurisdiction of the Drama School. In this way, it would be possible to preserve student-faculty and student-company relationships.

The problem of the organization of the professional theatre

company is a delicate one. Several different kinds of arrangements exist at present. UCLA hires what amounts to a producing unit; the University of Michigan hires an already existing company with an artistic director of its own (as does Pittsburgh at present); Stanford hires a group of actors, under contract to the University, to work within the organization of the Drama Department; and Seattle and Minneapolis hire an artistic director who forms a company separate from any existing organization within the community. Only the situations at Michigan and Seattle/Minneapolis seem applicable to Pittsburgh.

There are advantages to bringing in an already formed company with a quality and style of its own. It frees the community or some agency of the community of any responsibility in molding and shaping the ensemble and policy of the company. It maintains the total freedom and mobility of the company whereby the artistic director retains complete authority over its policy, procedures and staff. This is an important point to those who feel that any limitation placed upon the artistic freedom of the director will compromise the final product. Their view would be equivalent to saying committees cannot produce art.

There is another side to the story, however. To hire a company as a visitor for a period of time has questionable virtues. So long as the magnetic pull of Broadway continues to lure the worshipper to its shrine, the theatre in the rest of the country will have little gravity. There can be little thought of establishing resident theatres with any allegiance to the communities in which they perform. A community which hires a company for a season or part of a season is renting an expensive piece of equipment

which belongs to someone else. The bond existing between them is certified and can be cashed in at any time by either party.

A resident theatre, on the other hand, has a degree of permanence and solidity, like major symphony orchestras, which makes it possible to withstand the loss of an artistic director for any reason. And a resident company, with strong ties to the community, will of necessity be concerned about the kind and quality of training offered in the college drama school. It must be reiterated that separation of training and production is requisite to the adequate functioning of each, but one of the severest problems encountered in the course of this study is the separation of teacher and performer in mind as well as body. If equal authority and power can be maintained for each, the possibilities of growth and stimulation for both would be enormous. The acknowledged reputation of CIT Drama as a professional training school would seem to make the exchange of ideas and even personnel with a resident theatre very possible.

But it also must be emphasized that unless actors and others in the company have substantial freedom to work elsewhere for financial and prestige reasons, and unless the artistic director has complete autonomy in selection of plays, artistic personnel and in the determination of artistic policy and procedures, the vitality and creativity of the theatre will be sapped.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions are offered for a basic administrative breakdown:

(1) organizational separation of CIT Drama from professional company, the drama school under CIT administration, the professional company under the administration of CIT/ Playhouse Theatre

(2) legalization of CIT/Playhouse Theatre; formation of a Board of Directors composed of CIT faculty and staff (including the head of CIT Drama) and former members of The Playhouse Board

(3) appointment of an executive coordinator by the company to look for an artistic director; the artistic director to be hired by the parent company, and all members of the theatre company to be under contract to CIT/Playhouse Theatre; both the executive coordinator and the artistic director to sit as non-voting members of the Board of Directors

(4) the artistic director to have autonomy in the selection of play season, artistic company, artistic staff, and budget for the professional theatre; the Board of Directors of CIT/Playhouse Theatre to approve the annual budget of the professional theatre and review the efforts of the artistic director

(5) any new professional theatre building to be located off-campus with Club and Restaurant privileges retained; CIT Drama to have its own theatre with its own shops and studio space

(6) undergraduate training to be the exclusive concern of the CIT Drama Department; graduate fellowships to be offered constituting membership in a junior company of the professional theatre; instruction at the professional theatre to be under the jurisdiction of the artistic director in consultation with the head of the Drama School

(7) the executive coordinator to head a new division of community theatre to take the place of The Playhouse School two-year certificate program and its adult avocational activities; this new division to come under the jurisdiction of a CIT extension or adult education program; the executive coordinator to hold some academic rank at CIT as well as his position with CIT/Playhouse Theatre; the executive coordinator to determine the objectives, program, faculty and budget for this division with the approval of the CIT administration.

The basis for this minimal breakdown of administrative authority is the separation of the professional and training powers with coordination taking place on the level of the relation of each to the community of Pittsburgh through the CIT/Playhouse Theatre. The professional repertory theatre needs a chance to find its own way free of strong pressures from established institutions, but with the guidance of those who are particularly sympathetic to the growth of the arts in the community. CIT's nationally recognized drama school needs to build and expand on the basis of its distinguished efforts in the past free of the growing pains of professional theatre. Community theatre has

been through an upheaval and needs to find a way of reestablishing itself along new lines that will give it back some identity in coordination with the programs of professional and educational theatre.

Experience investigating other theatres in other places has convinced this consultant at this time that much of the "bad blood" that has hindered positive association between the "professional" and the "educator" is often produced by the confused and amorphous identity of each in relation to the other and to the community in which they are based. If we are to have an on-going affair and not a marriage, we'll need some of the maturity and understanding that come when both participants have power and authority of their own in relation to the idea of theatre in the community.

VII. APPENDIX

Names of people interviewed

CIT Drama Faculty

Henry Boettcher
William Nelson
W. Oren Parker
Lawrence Carra
Edith Skinner
Robert Parks
James Rosenberg
Jewel Walker
Lewis Palter
Elizabeth Kimberly
Arthur Wilmurt
Frederic Youens

CIT Administration

H. Russell Bintzer
Norman Rice
Edward Schatz

The Playhouse Board

Mrs. Richard S. Rauh
William H. Ford
Philip K. Herr
Jane Calloman
Charles N. Fischer
H. S. Overholt
Mrs. S. Eugene Bramer
Mrs. C. Stanton Belfour
Leland Hazard

The Playhouse Staff *

Mark Lewis
Marcie Felser
William Putch
Richard Hoover

Pittsburgh Foundations

C. Stanton Belfour
Theodore Hazlitt
Richard Scaife

Pittsburgh Community

Frank Bollinger
William Block
J. Wenneker
Donald Steinfirst
Barbara Cloud
Arthur Toner

Cleveland

K. Elmo Lowe
Barclay Leatham

Los Angeles

Ditta Oliker
Gordon Davidson
Ralph Freud
Abbott Kaplan
Lyle Dye

Stanford

Stephen Gaffrey

Seattle

Gregory Falls
Stuart Vaughan
Melvin Shapiro

Minneapolis

Kenneth Graham
Oliver Rea
McKnight Fellows (2)
Arthur Ballet
Frank Whiting

Ann Arbor

Robert Schnitzer
Marcella Cisney

* Past or present

ED054720

Summary of

Cooperative Research Project No. S-418

"Feasibility Study on Combining a Community Theatre with a College Drama Department"

Summary of

Cooperative Research Project No. S-418

"Feasibility Study on Combining A Community Theatre with a College Drama Department"

Investigator: Professor Theodore Kazanoff
Boston University

Project Director: Earle R. Gister
Head, Department of Drama
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

31 December 1965

The research summarized herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In April 1965, the Department of Drama, Carnegie Institute of Technology and The Pittsburgh Playhouse, both of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, joined together to form the Playhouse/Carnegie Tech Company. The purpose of this company was to develop a program of theater in Pittsburgh by means of a professional production of plays at the Playhouse and to pursue an educational program of advanced training in theater arts for those involved in the company. The following results were hoped for by developing this program:

1. to elevate the quality of theater production at the Playhouse to a level that would serve as a source of satisfaction and stimulation to Pittsburgh and that would give evidence that the community was one with a strong concern for the cultural growth of the performing arts in the United States.

2. to create for young and aspiring theater artists of more than average promise an educational program in an atmosphere of quality production so that their abilities could be developed and guided to professional maturation.

The Playhouse/Carnegie Tech Company engaged the services of Mr. William Ball and his producing and training organization known as The American Conservatory Theatre Foundation, Inc. (ACT). This group produced a season of twelve plays in repertory composed of classical and contemporary dramas at the Playhouse beginning 15 July 1965 and ending 6 December 1965. At the same time, Mr. Ball engaged his company in a training program on an advanced level. Many students of the Department of Drama and the Playhouse were given fellowships to work and perform with ACT. In the fall, members of ACT lectured and provided special courses for students in the Department of Drama at Carnegie Tech. The entire project was made possible by individual contributions, box office, grants

from local foundations, and a grant from The Rockefeller Foundation.

The creation of the Playhouse/Carnegie Tech Company stimulated interest in finding ways of bringing the activities and program of the Department of Drama into a closer, more formal and fully integrated association with The Pittsburgh Playhouse. In the initial conversations between the administrations of the two institutions, it was apparent that engaging ACT might serve the purposes of a pilot project but that other alternatives might be more attractive for creating a resident professional company in Pittsburgh. As contemplated, such a jointure suggested very complicated administrative problems without introducing a third entity (ACT). A study committee composed of administrative officers of The Pittsburgh Playhouse and Carnegie Institute of Technology discussed many of the problems at considerable length, but decided that an impartial and qualified individual was needed to assess the situation and make recommendations to the committee.

Mr. Theodore Kazanoff was engaged to do a feasibility study on behalf of Carnegie Tech. In addition to his other qualifications, Mr. Kazanoff was particularly well suited to serve as investigator because of his familiarity with Carnegie Tech after spending a year as Visiting Andrew Mellon Professor in Drama and with The Playhouse where he had acted in a production while in Pittsburgh. As the investigator, Mr. Kazanoff was supplied with a list of people to be interviewed and consulted in the preparation of his report. Also, he was required to travel and interview people in educational theater, community theater, and professional theater throughout the country who have tried or are in the process of formulating similar cooperative projects.

The objectives of the investigator's study, as outlined in writing by the Head of the Department of Drama at Carnegie Tech, were as follows: "to determine, by means of a feasibility study, the following:

a. the extent to which the activities and program of the Department of Drama, CIT, can be combined with those of The Pittsburgh Playhouse.

b. the areas of overlap, independent activity, and mutual responsibility in such a jointure.

c. the problem areas where further study or discussion is necessary.

d. the extent of community and national support for such a jointure.

e. the full range of possibilities created by this combination in the areas of education and producing theater.

f. the precedents established in programs developed in other parts of the country.

g. the means and time-table by which such an integration of activities can be accomplished."

The investigator devoted two months considering these points, interviewing people, and writing his report. The major portion of his time was spent in a series of interviews and consultation with:

a. current members of the CIT Department of Drama

b. selected members of the CIT administrative staff

c. selected members of The Playhouse Board

d. selected members of The Playhouse staff

e. several members of the Pittsburgh community, including local foundation authorities, although there was no attempt at a comprehensive sample of community opinion

f. heads of professional theater and university drama departments in Cleveland, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, Seattle, Minneapolis, and Ann Arbor.

In all, fifty-six (56) persons were interviewed, the great majority from groups a, b, c, and d. The opinions of the interviewees were put into written reports and are in the hands of the head of the Department of Drama. The investigator's report was based on a study of the interviews and represents the investigator's summation and evaluation of the issues raised in the interviews. The latter part of the report contains recommendations regarding the nature of the association.

The coming of a professional theater company to Pittsburgh, performing in a repertory of significant modern and classical plays generated an enthusiasm and excitement for theater which had not been felt for many years. This was the unanimous opinion of those interviewed in Pittsburgh. This excitement was expressed in different ways: the importance of professional production to the emerging cultural image of the city, the raising of standards of theater in play choice and performance, the significant changes in the quality of entertainment from emphasis on the light and trivial to plays of intellectual and aesthetic stature, a recognition of the advantages and need for advanced training of professional theater artists, and the possibilities by joining two major local theater forces, CIT and The Playhouse, to continue professional theater. This last element is considered at greatest length in the report.

Although majority opinion from CIT, The Playhouse, and the community favored some form of closer association, the investigator defined the many problems to be solved before any such formal cooperation could take place. These problems, discussed

in full in the report, are in the areas of objectives, motives and identity of both parties; the relation of Playhouse Club, Restaurant and School to any new entity; the location, size and nature of any new facilities which may be built as a result of the jointure; the administration of this new enterprise, the relationship of a new organizational structure to any professional company that might perform in Pittsburgh; and the organization and policy of the professional company itself. The main body of the report tries to summarize the opinions which were expressed on these subjects and to give some picture of the ways other university and community and/or professional theaters have answered these problems.

The investigator's conclusion lists the advantages to association, suggests changes that may result from an association, estimates the effects on the community and the training programs, and recommends a definite organization for the professional theater.